IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the application of:

Group Art Unit:

1713

LINDA N. WINSLOW

Examiner:

Robert D. Harlan

Serial No.:

10/087,028

Filed:

March 1, 2002

For:

DIMINE COMPLEXES FOR OLEFIN POLYMERIZATION

Attorney Docket No.: LYON 0127 PUS

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment Commissioner for Patents U.S. Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant hereby responds to the Office Action dated January 7, 2004. Claims 12-20 are pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicant wishes to express her appreciation to Examiner Harlan for removing the finality of the prior rejection.

The remaining claims, claims 12-20, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over *Hauptmann* WO 01/923342. As indicated previously, *Hauptmann* requires branching at both imino-bound carbon atoms, while Applicant expressly does not allow branching at both carbons. Thus, Hauptmann teaches away from the subject invention. The Office's position apparently is that aryl groups are not branched at the imino carbon. This, however is clearly incorrect. The relevant portion of the structure is shown below, with an aryl group bonded to the imino nitrogen:

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this paper, including all enclosures referred to herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail, postage pre-paid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Arexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

March 30,2004 Date of Deposit

William G. Conger Name of Person Signing

Signature

Atty Dkt No. LYON 0127 PUS

S/N: 10/087,028 Reply to Office Action of January 7, 2004



That the aryl group is branched is clearly shown by the fact that in traversing the aryl ring from the imino nitrogen, two alternative pathways may be taken:



The imino-bonded carbon (heavy black dot) is clearly a branch point. This is consistent with the way one skilled in the art would view the claim language. A Declaration Under Rule 132 can be submitted if the Examiner so desires, but the foregoing illustration should be sufficient to show that such a group is a branched hydrocarbon as that term is intended by Applicant. Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is solicited.

Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for Allowance, and respectfully request a Notice to that effect. If the Examiner believes that further discussion will advance the prosecution of the Application, the Examiner is highly encouraged to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

LINDA N. WINSLOW

William G. Conger Reg. No. 31,209

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

March **BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.** 1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400; Fax: 248-358-3351